

## REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated June 30, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on September 30, 2005. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-18, 26-31 and 33 remain pending in the application and are shown above. Claims 1-18, 26-31 and 33 stand rejected by the Examiner. Claim 10 have been cancelled without prejudice. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of claim 10 at a later date. Claim 12 has been amended to correct matters of form and is not presented to distinguish a reference, thus, is entitled to a full range of equivalents if not previously amended to distinguish a reference. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested for reasons presented below.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 10 has been cancelled without prejudice. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-18, 26-31 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over *Small et al.* (US Patent No. 6,498,131) in view of *Prigge et al.* (US Patent 5,167,667), *Scrovan* (US Patent No. 5,645,682), *Talieh et al.* (US Patent No. 5,692,947), *Kennedy et al.* (US Patent No. 6,280,299) and *Sirchevski et al.* (US Patent No. 6,352,595). The Examiner states that *Small et al.* teaches a method of cleaning a CMP apparatus with a cleaning composition and *Small et al.* does not specifically teach the concentration for amines. The Examiner further states that *Prigge et al.*, *Scrovan*, *Talieh et al.*, *Kennedy et al.* and *Sirchevski et al.* disclose that CMP polishing pads are conventionally cleaned and at least *Prigge et al.*, *Scrovan*, and *Talieh et al.* teach removal of residue from the pad in addition to cleaning. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The relevant reference date of *Small et al.* under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)/103 is the filing date, August 7, 2000. Applicants respectfully submit herewith an inventor's declaration under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 in a separate paper. As shown in the declaration under 37 C.F.R. §1.131, the invention as presently claimed by Applicants was conceived prior to August 7, 2000, and filed with due diligence prior to August 7, 2000, to the filing of the patent application on August 24, 2000. Therefore, *Small et al.* is not filed prior to the invention of the subject matter of claims 1-18, 26-31 and 33.

As stated by the Examiner, *Prigge et al.*, *Scrovan*, *Talieh et al.*, *Kennedy et al.* and *Sirchevski et al.* fail to teach the invention as claimed. Further, *Small et al.* is not as prior art under 35 USC § 102(e)/103, for reasons discussed above. Withdrawal of the rejection over combination of *Chen et al.*, *Prigge et al.*, *Scrovan*, *Talieh et al.*, *Kennedy et al.* and *Sirchevski et al.* is respectfully requested.

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, Applicant believes that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this office action.

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Ya-Fen Chen  
Registration No. 51,553  
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
3040 Post Oak Blvd., Suite 1500  
Houston, TX 77056  
Telephone: (713) 623-4844  
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846  
Attorney for Applicants